

**Application No.: 10/764,484**

**REMARKS**

**I. Introduction**

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 2, and 5-7 are independent. In this Amendment, claims 1-7 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

1. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,087 to Fadavi-Ardekani et al. (Fadavi-Ardekani) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,847,757 to Tietjen.

Applicant submits that Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, the applied combination of the references does not teach, among other things, "a clock generating device comprising a clock oscillating section generating a normal clock signal for supplying to the first and the second data input/output devices, and a clock wait control section generating a wait clock signal having a cycle which is integer times as much as the normal clock signal has," as recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner identified agents 100 and 104, and arbiter and switch 102 of Fadavi-Ardekani as the claimed first and second data input/output means (first and second data input/output devices) and clock generating means (clock generating device). It appears that the Examiner also identified agents 100 and 104 of Fadavi-Ardekani as the claimed access arranging device.

However, it is apparent that Fadavi-Ardekani does not teach, among other things, arbiter and switch 102 has a clock oscillating section generating a normal clock signal to be supplied to agents 100 and 104, and a clock wait control section generating a wait clock signal having a

**Application No.: 10/764,484**

cycle which is integer times as much as the normal clock signal has. In fact, the Examiner pointed out as follows: "Fadavi-Ardekani teaches each agent as having its own unique clock. The clock of one agent must enter a wait state to allow the other agent to access the memory. The wait state is generated to avoid contention among the multiple agents. Once one agent completes access, the other agent can access the memory." (the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action). Fadavi-Ardekani is silent on a device other than agents 100 and 104 which generates a clock signal and a wait clock signal, and another device which controls output of the clock signal and the wait clock signal.

In contrast, according to claim 1, the first and second data input/output devices normally receive a normal clock signal from the clock oscillating section of the clock generating device. When there is an access contention, the first data input/output device having a low priority may receive a wait clock signal having a cycle which is integer times as much as the normal clock signal has, from the clock wait control section of the clock generating device. Accordingly, Fadavi-Ardekani does not teach the claimed clock generating device having a clock oscillating section and the clock wait control section, and the access arranging device controlling the output of the normal clock signal and the wait clock signal. Nor does Tietjen teach these claimed limitations and cure the deficiencies of Fadavi-Ardekani.

In Fadavi-Ardekani, each agent generates a separate clock, as admitted by the Examiner. On the other hand, since Tietjen in column 1, lines 39-40 describes, "all clocks including the crystal oscillator are stopped while in this mode," all of clocks in Tietjen are stopped. Accordingly, if these references are combined even if the combination is assumed proper only for the sake of his response, the applied combination does not arrive at the claimed subject matter, as set forth above.

**Application No.: 10/764,484**

Further, Tietjen is directed to the switching of a normal mode and a wait mode, while Fadavi-Ardekani pertains to the shared usage of a memory by agents. Accordingly, these references are not within an analogous art. Furthermore, since Tietjen does not teach that a wait mode's trigger is the memory access contention, there is no motivation for combining these two references. The combination of Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen are improper.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. The above discussion is applicable to independent claims 1, 2, 5 and 6. Dependent claim 3 is also patentably distinguishable over Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen at least because the claim respectively includes all the limitations recited in independent claim 2. Applicant, therefore, respectfully solicits withdrawal of the rejection of claims and favorable consideration thereof.

2. Claim 7 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fadavi-Ardekani in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,102 to Peters.

Applicant incorporates herein the arguments regarding Fadavi-Ardekani made in response to the rejection of independent claim 1. The Examiner's additional comments and reference to Peters do not cure the deficiencies of Fadavi-Ardekani. Applicant, therefore, respectfully solicits withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 and favorable consideration thereof.

3. Claim 4 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,102 to Peters.

Claim 4 depends on claim 2. Applicant thus incorporates herein the arguments made in response to the rejection of independent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness as

JUL 21 2008

**Application No.: 10/764,484**

predicted upon Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen. The Examiner's additional comments and reference to Peters do not cure the deficiencies of the applied combination of Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

### **III. Conclusion**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

*for* Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

*Reg. # 60,453*

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
Date: July 21, 2008

Please recognize our Customer No. 53080  
as our correspondence address.